

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/073,959	02/14/2002	Hisashi Nakamura	042288	8711	
38834	7590 05/04/2005		EXAMINER		
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP 1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			LIU, MIN	LIU, MING HUN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2675		
	•		DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004	DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/073,959 Filing Date: February 14, 2002 Appellant(s): NAKAMURA ET AL. **MAILED**

MAY 04 2005

Technology Center 2600

Ming-Hun Liu For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Application/Control Number: 10/073,959

Art Unit: 2675

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 12/15/2004.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Issues

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) Grouping of Claims

The rejection of claims 2 and 3 stand or fall together because appellant's brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims does not stand or fall together and reasons in support thereof. See 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7).

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/073,959 Page 3

Art Unit: 2675

(9) Prior Art of Record

6,322,218 Sugawara et al 11-2001

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,322,218 to Sugawara et al.

In reference to independent claims 2 and 3, Sugawara anticipates the applicant's invention. By referring to figure 3 and column 8, lines 10-20, it can be seen that Sugawara's invention includes the same electrical components as claimed by the applicant. Specially, Sugawara teaches a liquid crystal projector with a cooling fan (items 10 and 12), a temperature sensor for detecting the internal temperature of the liquid crystal projector (item 30), and an air pressure sensor for detecting an outside air pressure (item 56), a driving circuit for the cooling fan (44, 46 and 52; column 7, lines 65-67).

Sugawara also teaches a storage means for storing a control table representing the relationship between the temperature detected by the temperature sensor and the value of a control voltage (figure 8 and column 10, line 55: "a table of a fan applied voltage versus temperature"). Sugawara continues by stating that figure 8 is a graph/table is "at the position where the reference height is an atmosphere pressure" thus anticipating the applicant's limitation of for the driving circuit of the cooling fan for each of a plurality of classes into which the outside air pressure is divided (column 15, lines 22-35)

Art Unit: 2675

Sugawara also teaches a means for determining the value of the control voltage (item 52 and 46, column 7, line 66-column 8, line 1) to the driving circuit of the cooling fan. Later on column 15, lines 15-19, Sugawara teaches the incorporation of all three variables in the determination of temperature compensation. "When a relationship of a heat sink of head pipe versus a **temperature** detecting element receives the influence of **air pressure** variations, the temperature compensation can be performed by monitoring the fan rotational frequency, **applied voltage...**" in another words, when the temperature and pressures are changing, the temperature compensation can be performed by monitoring the applied voltage and not just the two variables (temperature and air pressure). Sugawara then continues to teach that temperature compensation TO can be created based on the pressure of various classes of atmospheric pressures (column 15, lines 30-37).

(11) Response to Argument

The applicant argues that Sugawara fails to teach a table that represents temperature to control voltage is incorrect as made apparent in figure 8. The applicant's argument that Sugawara fails to include three variables, temperature, control voltage and air pressure is also incorrect because on Sugawara explicitly states that "In figure 8, the lateral axis refers to the fan applied voltage and the vertical axis refers to the temperature of the liquid crystal light value 4G. Further figure 8, shows that the fan applied voltage at the position where the reference height is an atmospheric pressure (760 mm Hg)..." In this case the V vs. T graph was drafted at a particular atmospheric class P at 760 mm Hg.

Application/Control Number: 10/073,959

Art Unit: 2675

Page 5

to two variable inputs. It is clear that temperature, air pressure and applied voltages can be used

And as explained in the rejection of claims 2 and 3, Sugawara does not limit his invention

to determine the compensation factor (column 15, lines 15-19). Furthermore, the air pressures

can be stratified to different levels according to the positioning of the device (column 15, lines

30-37).

Sugawara also teaches the use of other pressure classes on column 15, lines 30-37.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Ming-Hun Liu April 7, 2005

Conferees

Sumati Lefkowitz SL

Richard Hjerpe

RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC LION BUILDING 1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501

WASHINGTON, DC 20036

SUMATI LEFKOWITZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER